

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 16-30 are pending in the application, with claims 16 and 28 being the independent claims. Claims 17-20, 22, 23, and 28 have been amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objection to the Specification

The specification is objected to for various alleged informalities. Without acquiescing to the merits of this allegation, Applicants have amended the specification to accommodate the Examiner's objection. Applicants respectfully request the objection to the specification be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Objection to the Claims

Claims 17-20, 22-25, and 28-30 are objected to for various alleged informalities. Without acquiescing to the merits of this allegation, Applicants have amended claims 17-20, 22-25, and 28-30 to accommodate the Examiner's objection. Applicants respectfully request the objection to claims 17-20, 22-25, and 28-30 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regards as the invention. Without acquiescing to the merits of this allegation, Applicants have amended claim 23 to accommodate the Examiner's rejection. Applicants respectfully request the rejection to claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Other Matters

Double Patenting

Claim 28 stands rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being allegedly unpatentable over claim 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,711,227. Applicants have submitted a Terminal Disclaimer herewith to overcome the double patenting rejection with respect to the claim presented above. The filing of this Terminal Disclaimer is not an admission of the propriety of the rejection. (*see, Quad Environmental Technologies Corp. v. Union Sanitary District*, 946 F.2d 870, 20 USPQ2d 1392 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Allowed Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 16, 21, and 26-27 in the Office Action.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 17-20 and 22-25 stand objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the objections set forth the Office Action. From the discussion above, Applicants have rewritten or amended claims 17-20, 22, and 23 to overcome the objections. Dependent claims 24 and 25 are likewise allowable for being dependent upon an allowable base claim and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection of claims 17-20 and 22-25 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 23-25 stand objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, set forth the Office Action. From the discussion above, Applicants have rewritten or amended claim 23 to overcome the rejection. Dependent claims 24 and 25 are likewise allowable for being dependent upon an allowable base claim and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection of claims 23-25 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 28-30 stand objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the objections set forth the Office Action and a timely filed terminal disclaimer. From the discussion above, Applicants have rewritten or amended claim 28 to overcome the objections set forth the Office Action and submitted a Terminal Disclaimer herewith to overcome the double patenting rejection with respect to claim 28. Dependent claims 29 and 30 are likewise allowable for being dependent upon an allowable base claim and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully request that the objection of claims 28-30 and 22-25 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 36,013

Date: 11/13/07

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

740939_1.DOC